UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

| APPLICATION NO.  | FILING DATE               | FIRST NAMED INVENTOR | ATTORNEY DOCKET NO. | CONFIRMATION NO. |  |
|--|---------------------------|----------------------|---------------------|------------------|--|
| 10/612,783   | 07/02/2003                | Thomas J. La Rosa    | 38-21(53373)A       | 2839             |  |
| 27161<br>MONSANTO C  | 7590 01/09/200<br>COMPANY | EXAMINER             |                     |                  |  |
| 800 N. LINDBERGH BLVD.<br>ATTENTION: GAIL P. WUELLNER, IP PARALEGAL, (E2NA)<br>ST. LOUIS, MO 63167 |                           |                      | BUI, PHUONG T       |                  |  |
|  |                           |                      | ART UNIT            | PAPER NUMBER     |  |
|  |                           | 1638                 |                     |                  |  |
|  |                           |                      |                     |                  |  |
|  |                           |                      | MAIL DATE           | DELIVERY MODE    |  |
|  |                           |                      | 01/09/2009          | PAPER            |  |

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

## Advisory Action Before the Filing of an Appeal Brief

| Application No. | Applicant(s)   |  |  |
|-----------------|----------------|--|--|
| 10/612,783      | LA ROSA ET AL. |  |  |
| Examiner        | Art Unit       |  |  |
| Phuong T. Bui   | 1638           |  |  |

|  | Filading 1. But  | 1030   |  |  |  |  |
|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|
| The MAILING DATE of this communication appe  | ears on the cover sheet with the   | correspondence add   | ress                                     |  |  |  |
| THE REPLY FILED <u>29 December 2008</u> FAILS TO PLACE THIS  | S APPLICATION IN CONDITION F   | OR ALLOWANCE.  |  |  |  |  |
| 1.  The reply was filed after a final rejection, but prior to or on application, applicant must timely file one of the following application in condition for allowance; (2) a Notice of Appetor Continued Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 Coperiods:  | replies: (1) an amendment, affidavi<br>eal (with appeal fee) in compliance   | t, or other evidence, v<br>with 37 CFR 41.31; o            | hich places the (3) a Request            |  |  |  |
| a) The period for reply expiresmonths from the mailing   | g date of the final rejection.   |  |  |  |  |  |
| b) The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this A no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire I: Examiner Note: If box 1 is checked, check either box (a) or (MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 706.07)   | ater than SIX MONTHS from the mailing (b). ONLY CHECK BOX (b) WHEN THE (f).  | g date of the final rejection<br>FIRST REPLY WAS FI        | on.<br>LED WITHIN TWO                    |  |  |  |
| Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of exunder 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b) NOTICE OF APPEAL | tension and the corresponding amount<br>shortened statutory period for reply origi<br>than three months after the mailing da | of the fee. The appropri-<br>inally set in the final Offic | ate extension fee<br>e action; or (2) as |  |  |  |
| 2. The Notice of Appeal was filed on . A brief in comp   | liance with 37 CFR 41.37 must be   | filed within two month                                     | s of the date of                         |  |  |  |
| filing the Notice of Appeal (37 CFR 41.37(a)), or any exter<br>Notice of Appeal has been filed, any reply must be filed w<br>AMENDMENTS  |  |  | e appeal. Since a                        |  |  |  |
| 3. The proposed amendment(s) filed after a final rejection, I  | out prior to the date of filing a brief,   | will not be entered be                                     | cause                                    |  |  |  |
| (a) They raise new issues that would require further co  | •  | TE below);   |  |  |  |  |
| <ul> <li>(b) ☐ They raise the issue of new matter (see NOTE belo</li> <li>(c) ☐ They are not deemed to place the application in bet appeal; and/or</li> </ul>  | •  | ducing or simplifying t                                    | ne issues for                            |  |  |  |
| (d) ☐ They present additional claims without canceling a NOTE: (See 37 CFR 1.116 and 41.33(a)).  | corresponding number of finally rej  | ected claims.  |  |  |  |  |
| 4. The amendments are not in compliance with 37 CFR 1.12   | 21. See attached Notice of Non-Co  | mpliant Amendment (  | PTOL-324).                               |  |  |  |
| 5. Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s):  |  | ,  | ,  |  |  |  |
| 6. Newly proposed or amended claim(s) would be allowable if submitted in a separate, timely filed amendment canceling non-allowable claim(s).  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 7.  For purposes of appeal, the proposed amendment(s): a) how the new or amended claims would be rejected is provide status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows: Claim(s) allowed:  |  | ll be entered and an e                                     | xplanation of                            |  |  |  |
| Claim(s) objected to:  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Claim(s) rejected: <u>1,2 and 9-13</u> .   |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration: AFFIDAVIT OR OTHER EVIDENCE   |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| <ol> <li>The affidavit or other evidence filed after a final action, bu<br/>because applicant failed to provide a showing of good and<br/>was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 1.116(e).</li> </ol>   |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| <ol> <li>The affidavit or other evidence filed after the date of filing<br/>entered because the affidavit or other evidence failed to o<br/>showing a good and sufficient reasons why it is necessary</li> </ol>   | vercome <u>all</u> rejections under appea  | al and/or appellant fail                                   | s to provide a                           |  |  |  |
| 10. ☐ The affidavit or other evidence is entered. An explanatio REQUEST FOR RECONSIDERATION/OTHER  | n of the status of the claims after e  | ntry is below or attach                                    | ed.                                      |  |  |  |
| <ol> <li>The request for reconsideration has been considered bu<br/><u>See Continuation Sheet.</u></li> </ol>  | t does NOT place the application ir  | n condition for allowan                                    | ce because:                              |  |  |  |
| <ul><li>12. ☐ Note the attached Information <i>Disclosure Statement</i>(s).</li><li>13. ☐ Other:</li></ul>   | (PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | /DI  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | /Phuong T. Bui/<br>Primary Examiner, Art U   | Jnit 1638  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

Continuation of 11. does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: 101: due to diverse functions of P450 members affecting virtually all plant functions, being a member of the p450 family does not automatically establish utility for reasons of record. Having 54% identity to a known P450 does not establish utility. There are no working examples or recognition by the state of the art at filing to evidence that two proteins having 54% identity would have the same function. With regard to cited reference Werck-Reichhart, possessing "hallmark" motifs of P450 does not establish utility. Possessing a motif which prior art states is "important as a ligand to heme iron" for P450 family does not provide guidance as to how SEQ ID NO:3366 should be used to achieve a utility from the laundry list of utilities applicable to virtually all proteins in specification.

112, 1<sup>st</sup>: Maintained with regard to 101 for above reasons and reasons of record. With regard to percent identity, claims not enabled because claims are not limited to degenerate codons or conservative a.a. substitutions. The specification does not provide guidance as to where the critical regions that should be avoided are as argued.